

REMARKS -

In response to the pending office action dated August 25, 2006, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 11, and 19 and cancelled claim 9 to better clarify the invention. The Applicant is concurrently paying a 1-month extension fee and believes that no other fees are due at this time; however, charge any additional fees required by this paper and/or to maintain this application, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 15-0450.

Claim Rejections - § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-11, and 19 as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,189,174 to Hohl, and U.S. Patent No. 2,297,375 to Vogt. The Applicant claims a bag that includes a front, a back, two sides, a bottom, and an interior surface formed of a polymeric material. The bottom of the bag is closed by folding portions of the multi-ply blank into an adhesively secured quadrilateral shape. Neither Hohl nor Vogt disclose the bag claimed by the Applicant. Vogt teaches away from a bag having four sides (front, back and two sides) and a folded, quadrilateral bottom by specifically teaching a bag that is free of any protruding corners (for improved funnel-assisted dispensing). (See Vogt, page 3, column 1, lines 24-28.) Specifically, the bag taught by Vogt is a tubular bag having a sealed bottom formed by pressing together the tube's opposing halves (i.e., pair of panels or walls) under heat. (See Vogt, page 2, column 2, lines 14-29.) Hohl also teaches a tubular bag having a similarly formed bottom. (See Hohl, page 2, column 2, lines 39-41, and Figures 5 and 6.) Consequently, neither Vogt or Hohl teach the polymerically lined bag as claimed by the Applicant. Therefore, the Applicant believes that all claims are allowable over Vogt and Hohl, and respectfully requests that the Examiner remove its rejections.

Claim Rejections - § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 3 as being unpatentable over Hohl or Vogt, and claims 7, 8, 12, and 13 over Hohl or Vogt and U.S. Patent No. 3,291,374 to Lepisto et al. Because the Applicant believes presently-amended claims 1 and 11 are allowable over Hohl and Vogt, dependent claims 3, 7, 8, 12, and 13 are also believed allowable. Therefore, the Applicant

respectfully requests the Examiner to remove the present rejections and allow claims 3, 7, 8, 12, and 13.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, the applicant submits that all rejections have been overcome. Therefore, the Applicant believes the present Application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP

Date: December 26, 2006

One GOJO Plaza, Suite 300
Akron, OH 44311-1076
Tel.: (330) 864-5550

By: /Bret A. Hrivnak/
Bret A. Hrivnak
Reg. No. 54,714